

REMARKS

The following remarks are offered in response to the Second Official Action dated July 2, 2003. Claims 1, 3, 22, 26-28, 30-32, 77, 81 and 83 are amended herein. New Claims 84 and 85 are added herein. Claims 18 and 67 are canceled herein. Claims 1, 3-17, 19-20, 22-24, 26-66, and 68-85 are pending. The Commissioner is authorized to charge the Applicants' account, Deposit Account No. 05-1328, for any fees required by this amendment and response. Reconsideration and reexamination of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks and amendments to Claims 1, 22, 77 and 81. The support for the amendment of Claims 1, 22, 77 and 81 is found in former Claims 18 and 67, at Page 13, Lines 24-25, Page 18, Lines 6-7, and Page 45, Lines 18-19. The support for new Claims 84 and 85 is found in previously canceled claims 2 and 25. Claims 3, 26-28, 30-32 and 83 are only amended to change such claim's dependencies.

In the Office Action, the Examiner made the following rejections:

Claims 1, 16, 17, 19, 22, 24, 26, 30, 32, 65, 66, 68, 70-72, 77-81 and 83 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §102 as being anticipated by U.S. 5,294,353 to Dill ("Dill");

Claims 1, 16, 17, 22, 24, 65, 66, 77-81 and 83 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §102 as being anticipated by U.S. 3,804,760 to Darley ("Darley");

Claims 3-15, 18, 20, 23, 27-29, 31, 33-64, 67, 69, 73-76 and 82 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would otherwise be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

During a personal interview conducted August 12, 2003, the Applicants, represented by Douglas J. Collins, and Examiner Tucker discussed the rejections contained in the Second Office Action and the Dill and Darley references. Agreement was reached concerning that in the acid pretreatment aspect of Claim 1, the addition of a clarifying statement that the solids-stabilized emulsion is formed by adding water after the acid pretreatment would make the acid treatment aspect of Claim 1 allowable. With regard to the thermal treatment aspect, the Examiner suggested that the addition of language concerning the pressure at which the thermal treatment was

conducted or the occurrence of a change in TAN or toluene equivalence during thermal treatment would make the thermal treatment aspect of Claim 1 allowable. The Applicants stated that they would consider the Examiner's suggestions.


The Applicants hereby submit amendments to Claims 1, 22, 77 and 81 that are based upon the agreement reached with respect to the acid treatment aspect of Claim 1 and one portion of the Examiner's suggestion with respect to the thermal treatment. Claims 1, 22 and 77, as amended, are not taught or suggested by Darley or Dill and are believed allowable over all art of record.

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants believe that the prior art does not teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, all the elements of independent Claims 1, 22, 77 and 81. The dependent claims are also believed patentable since they depend on independent Claims 1 and 22 for the reasons discussed above. Applicants therefore respectfully request that this application be allowed and passed to issue.

If Examiner wishes to discuss this application with counsel, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

August 27, 2003


Douglas J. Collins
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 43,561


ExxonMobil Upstream Research Company
P.O. Box 2189
Houston, Texas 77252-2189

Telephone: (713) 431-4811
Facsimile: (713) 431-4664

OFFICIAL

Certificate of Facsimile Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to Examiner Phillip Tucker, Technology Center 1700, United States Patent and Trademark Office at (703) 872-9311 on August 27, 2003.


Margaret Gnewuch

FAX RECEIVED

AUG 27 2003

TO: 700